

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 10, 2003 LB 165

not have the advantage of lower borrowing rates and will not have the advantage of not having to pay stockholders, then I think we should be asking ourselves the question of why don't we make NPPD to get their act together and operate this themselves with the advantages they...that they have and make it work. So clarifying as between not-for-profit and profit corporations, both in a philosophic and in a practical sense, is I think a very, very important thing to do on this particular bill. That's the first item. The second item is that the ability to indemnify in this bill is extremely broad. In fact, there is no limitation at all except insofar as describing negligence and the paragraph may have some limiting effect. But I think the bill needs to have some very, very specific exceptions and more detail with respect to what it is that is being indemnified. For example, a little ordinary item like property insurance, automobile insurance; I don't think we should be indemnifying them on items such as that and I don't think that's intended. But when you're talking about the question of an indemnification and the potential of large amounts of money, I think it's important to be as exact and as limiting as we can without scuttling the purpose of the bill. So I think there needs to be more detail on the bill with regard to limitations on indemnification. The third area of concern that as far as I understand right now definitely needs clarification has to do with the Political Subdivisions Tort Claims Act. Under that act, there are specific protections and limitations, both procedural and substantive, with respect to what a political subdivision may be required to pay out to a claimant. And it's important that NPPD continue to be under that act as it is currently, but there is some language in the act that says that people with whom you contract out are not protected, are not subject to the act, which presents the possibility that by contracting out, perhaps we either will be uncovered in an insurance area where we were previously...that we previously didn't have to worry about because it was limited, or we may have to buy additional insurance that we didn't have to buy before because we're not covered under that act. So that particular act it seems to me needs to be clarified so that we understand clearly that entering into an agreement with NMC is an act of creating an agency and not an act of creating an independent contractor, a distinction that's dubious and